

Inclusive Organization Culture Enhances Job Satisfaction- A Study of Selected Service Sector Organizations in Jammu region

Syeda Shazia Bukhari*
Prof. B.C. Sharma**

*Assistant Professor
School of Business, College
of Management, SMVDU, Katra

**Dean Placements
The Business School
University of Jammu, J&K

Abstract

The corporate world today is known for diversity as people of different genders, races, ages, backgrounds, cultures, regions etc. are working together which is challenging for the management. This diversity if harnessed properly leads to creativity and innovation which are key elements to competitive advantage but this can be done only if equity is perceived among employees especially males and females. This study is focusing on the factor that inclusive organization culture enhances job satisfaction by analyzing the employees of service sector, the sample size being 164. Outcome of the study reveals that all variables of inclusive organization culture and job satisfaction are correlated whether positively or negatively.

Keywords:

Inclusive organisation culture, Job satisfaction, Recruitment.

Introduction

Till the privatisation of the Indian economy in the early 1990s, Indian organisations were extremely bureaucratic and were characterised by one-way flow of decision making from the top to the bottom, which is not uncommon in social cultures dominated by collectivism and high power distance norms (Hofstede, 2001). However, with the liberalisation of the Indian business environment, managerial practices, especially those related to the cognitive and affective facets of individual employees at the workplace, underwent major alterations. Furthermore, human resource (HR) practices in Indian firms have experienced a sea change, as contemporary HR policies and practices are designed in a manner that promotes individual involvement on the job (Biswas, 2006; Budhwar and Khatri, 2001; Pattnaik and Biswas, 2005). As Biswas and Varma (2007) observed, 'HR practices in India are increasingly geared towards improving the way individual employees perceive their day-to-day working environment, or the way they perceive the psychological climate in the workplace'. Organisation culture refers to a system of shared meaning held by members that distinguishes the organisation from other organizations (Stephen Robbins). Employees form an overall subjective perception of the organisation based on such factors as degree of risk tolerance, team emphasis, and support of people. This overall perception becomes, in effect, the organisation's culture or personality. These favourable or unfavourable perceptions then affect employee performance and satisfaction, with the impact being greater for stronger cultures.

Literature Review

The organizational culture includes norms, values, core assumptions and

behaviours promoted in an organisation; work processes and practices; roles and types of work; core management systems (such as performance appraisal and reward systems); decision making and communication processes (both formal and informal); resource allocation processes; accepted leadership and management styles and the use and management of time. Chalofsky (2003) says, the best employers are not because of their perks and benefits, but because of their organisational culture and policies that promote meaningful work, and a nurturing as well as supportive workplace. If inclusive organizational culture is promoted at the workplace, it would lead to increased job satisfaction among employees and would increase their commitment to the organisation. Porter et al., 1974; Steers, 1977, said that an individual whose needs are satisfied in an organisation is more likely to be committed and likely to stay with the organisation. While another body of research (William and Hazer, 1986; Brown and Peterson, 1993; DeConink and Stilwell, 2004) suggests that it is organisational commitment that indicates the relationship between job satisfaction and job commitment. Organisational effectiveness or performance is defined as the degree to which an organisation attains its short-term and long-term goals, the selection of which reflects strategic constituencies, the self-interest of the evaluator, and the life-stage of the organisation (Robbins, 2001). As far as the relationship between organisational culture and organisational effectiveness is concerned, it is argued that organisations possessing a strong culture that is congruent with their top management leadership style, organisational structure and internal management practices attain higher levels of effectiveness than their competitors (Arogyaswamy and Byles, 1987; Robbins, 2001). Gender equity and inclusive organizational culture would lead to job satisfaction among female employees leading to higher retention and increased organization commitment. Schwartz (1989) revealed that top women managers were two and half times more likely to leave their employment than men, not because of family obligations but due to dissatisfaction with their career prospects. In a longitudinal study of mid-career MBAs, Schreier and Reitman (1994) reported that gender did not affect the work environment during early careers, but mid-career women compared with their counterparts were less satisfied, on lower salaries, feeling less appreciated by their boss, and experiencing more discrimination. A study Sandhu and Mehta (2007), attempts to develop, refine and validate a scale for measuring attitudes of women executives towards their job. The findings reveal that women executives are quite positive in their approach and are reportedly accepted as executives in India. A study by Biswas (2010) studies that the two attitudinal variables of job satisfaction and job involvement act as mediators between psychological climate and employees' turnover intentions and extends it to their impact on organisational effectiveness. If gender equity and inclusive organizational culture are promoted at the workplace, it would lead to increased job satisfaction especially among female employees and would increase their commitment to the organisation. Porter et al., 1974; Steers, 1977, said that an individual whose needs are satisfied in an organisation is more likely to be committed and likely to stay with the organisation.

Objectives of The Study

1. To study the difference in recruitment opportunity, compensation packages, promotion policy and participation in decision making for both male and female employees.

2. To study the relationship between inclusive organisational culture and job satisfaction.

Hypotheses

H1a:- Inclusive organisation culture is significantly correlated to equal representation of both male and female employees at all the levels of management.

H1b:- Inclusive organizational culture has a positive impact on job satisfaction

Research Methodology

In the light of aforesaid hypotheses, following sequential steps will be taken to cover the various aspects of research methodology.

Generation of Scale Items

The organisation culture construct was based on inventory developed by Cooke and Lafferty (1989). The job satisfaction construct was based on an 12 item instrument based on Minnesota Index.

Data Collection

Data was collected from the different branches of the 3 public and 5 private organisations functioning in Jammu city. Four organizations are related to banking sector, three to telecom and one is related to insurance sector. Preliminary survey could reveal that these organisations had sizeable number of female employees across different levels compared to other organisations, that is why these organisations were chosen. The sample size was taken 250 including both males and females but only 164 responses were received thus having a response rate of 65.6%. The questionnaires were distributed at various branches and offices with the help of HR heads using stratified sampling as involvement of all the three management levels was taken care of. Out of these 164 respondents 77 were males and 87 were females. Employees at key positions like vice presidents, branch managers, operational heads (both genders) were interviewed personally also to know the policy measures taken by these organizations to promote inclusive organization culture and hence increase job satisfaction.

Data Analysis and Statistical Tools

The data will be analysed with the help of SPSS. The statistical tools like mean, standard deviation, correlation, ANOVA, chi-square test along with crosstabs was used for analysing the data and hypothesis testing. Mean and standard deviation would be calculated for key variables inclusive organisational culture and job satisfaction. Correlation was found out between the key variables like inclusive organisational culture and job satisfaction. Analysis of Variance was used to know that there is no significant difference in recruitment opportunity, compensation packages, promotion opportunities and participation in decision making among both male and female employees.

Reliability And Validity

The Cronbach alpha values were used for examining the reliability of the constructs. The different validity measures were examined before data analysis. Although all the items in the questionnaire were standardized with little moderation to continue the flow, still reliability was measured and the low value of Cronbach alpha (.587) suggests that the construct is reliable.

Reliability**Scale: ALL VARIABLES****Case Processing Summary**

		N	%
Cases	Valid	164	99.4
	Excluded ^a	1	.6
	Total	165	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 1 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.506	.587	23

Tools used for Analysis-

The first objective of studying the difference in recruitment opportunity, compensation packages, promotion policy and participation in decision making for both male and female

employees was analysed by using one-way ANOVA on 13 statements relating to promoting equality of both the genders while recruiting, allocating, developing and promoting the employees in which they had to answer in Yes or No, 1 for Yes and 2 for No. The Oneway

Descriptives- Table 2

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
1(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.12	.323	.037	1.04	1.19	1	2
	2	87	1.23	.423	.045	1.14	1.32	1	2
	Total	164	1.18	.383	.030	1.12	1.24	1	2
2(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.56	.500	.057	1.44	1.67	1	2
	2	87	1.46	.501	.054	1.35	1.57	1	2
	Total	164	1.51	.501	.039	1.43	1.58	1	2
3(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.92	.270	.031	1.86	1.98	1	2
	2	87	1.94	.234	.025	1.89	1.99	1	2
	Total	164	1.93	.251	.020	1.89	1.97	1	2
4(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.56	.500	.057	1.44	1.67	1	2
	2	87	1.48	.503	.054	1.38	1.59	1	2
	Total	164	1.52	.501	.039	1.44	1.60	1	2
5(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.53	.502	.057	1.42	1.65	1	2
	2	87	1.49	.503	.054	1.39	1.60	1	2
	Total	164	1.51	.501	.039	1.43	1.59	1	2

6(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.08	.270	.031	1.02	1.14	1	2
	2	87	1.06	.234	.025	1.01	1.11	1	2
Total		164	1.07	.251	.020	1.03	1.11	1	2
7(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.10	.307	.035	1.03	1.17	1	2
	2	87	1.44	.499	.053	1.33	1.54	1	2
Total		164	1.28	.451	.035	1.21	1.35	1	2
8(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.13	.338	.039	1.05	1.21	1	2
	2	87	1.07	.255	.027	1.01	1.12	1	2
Total		164	1.10	.298	.023	1.05	1.14	1	2
9(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.05	.223	.025	1.00	1.10	1	2
	2	87	1.07	.255	.027	1.01	1.12	1	2
Total		164	1.06	.240	.019	1.02	1.10	1	2
10(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.06	.248	.028	1.01	1.12	1	2
	2	87	1.15	.359	.038	1.07	1.23	1	2
Total		164	1.11	.314	.024	1.06	1.16	1	2
11(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.58	.496	.057	1.47	1.70	1	2
	2	87	1.64	.482	.052	1.54	1.75	1	2
Total		164	1.62	.488	.038	1.54	1.69	1	2
12(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.90	.307	.035	1.83	1.97	1	2
	2	87	1.89	.321	.034	1.82	1.95	1	2
Total		164	1.89	.314	.024	1.84	1.94	1	2
13(yes-1,No-2)	1	77	1.14	.352	.040	1.06	1.22	1	2
	2	87	1.16	.370	.040	1.08	1.24	1	2
Total		164	1.15	.361	.028	1.10	1.21	1	2

ANOVA - Tsble 4

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.522	1	.522	3.619	.059
	Within Groups	23.350	162	.144		
	Total	23.872	163			
2(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.398	1	.398	1.587	.210
	Within Groups	40.596	162	.251		
	Total	40.994	163			
3(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.017	1	.017	.270	.604
	Within Groups	10.245	162	.063		
	Total	10.262	163			
4(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.234	1	.234	.931	.336
	Within Groups	40.711	162	.251		
	Total	40.945	163			

5(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.060	1	.060	.236	.628
	Within Groups	40.916	162	.253		
	Total	40.976	163			
6(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.017	1	.017	.270	.604
	Within Groups	10.245	162	.063		
	Total	10.262	163			
7(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	4.526	1	4.526	25.665	.000
	Within Groups	28.571	162	.176		
	Total	33.098	163			
8(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.152	1	.152	1.718	.192
	Within Groups	14.288	162	.088		
	Total	14.439	163			
9(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.012	1	.012	.204	.652
	Within Groups	9.378	162	.058		
	Total	9.390	163			
10(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.292	1	.292	3.003	.085
	Within Groups	15.733	162	.097		
	Total	16.024	163			
11(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.143	1	.143	.601	.439
	Within Groups	38.655	162	.239		
	Total	38.799	163			
12(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.005	1	.005	.050	.823
	Within Groups	16.019	162	.099		
	Total	16.024	163			
13(yes-1,No-2)	Between Groups	.013	1	.013	.102	.750
	Within Groups	21.176	162	.131		
	Total	21.189	163			

Since the value of significance of F for all the variables is greater than 0.05 as per table 4, the first hypothesis is accepted, i.e. there is a significant difference in recruitment opportunities, involvement in decision making, selection, promotion, mentoring, skill development etc.

Gender(1-male,2- female) * Job Level(Lower-1, Middle-2,Top-3) Crosstabulation – Table 5

Count

		Job Level(Lower-1, Middle-2,Top-3)			Total
		1	2	3	
Gender(1-male,2- female)	1	16	59	2	77
	2	41	42	4	87
Total		57	101	6	164

This table 5 shows that in the given sample 16 males are at lower level, 59 at middle level and 2 at top level. 41 females are at lower level, 42 at middle and 4 at top level.

Chi-Square Tests – Table 6

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.935 ^a	2	.001
Likelihood Ratio	14.291	2	.001
Linear-by-Linear Association	8.372	1	.004
N of Valid Cases	164		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.82. The lower value of Pearson Chi-Square test i.e. .001 shows that there is significant interrelationship between gender and job level.

Case Processing Summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Gender(1-male,2- female) * Job Level(Lower-1, Middle-2,Top-3)	164	99.4%	1	.6%	165	100.0%
Gender(1-male,2- female) * Work Experience(<10-1,10-20-2, 20-30-3,>30-4	164	99.4%	1	.6%	165	100.0%
Marital Status(Married-1, Single/Unmarried-2) * Job Level(Lower-1, Middle-2,Top-3)	164	99.4%	1	.6%	165	100.0%
Marital Status(Married-1, Single/Unmarried-2) * Work Experience(<10-1,10-20-2, 20-30-3,>30-4	164	99.4%	1	.6%	165	100.0%

Gender(1-male,2- female) * Work Experience(<10-1,10-20-2, 20-30-3,>30-4

Crosstab- Table 7

Count		Work Experience(<10-1,10-20-2, 20-30-3,>30-4				Total
		1	2	3	4	
Gender(1-male,2- female)	1	21	21	18	17	77
	2	36	17	8	26	87
Total		57	38	26	43	164

Majority of the females are having experience lower than 20 years (61%) as compared to 54% males as shown in Table 7

Chi-Square Tests - Table 8

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	9.524 ^a	3	.023
Likelihood Ratio	9.651	3	.022
Linear-by-Linear Association	.452	1	.501
N of Valid Cases	164		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 12.21.

The lower value of Pearson Chi Square test .023 shows there is significant relationship between work experience and gender.

Marital Status(Married-1, Single/Unmarried-2) * Job Level(Lower-1, Middle-2,Top-3)**Crosstab- Table 9**

Count

		Work Experience(<10-1,10-20-2, 20-30-3,>30-4)				Total
		1	2	3	4	
Marital Status(Married-1, Single/Unmarried-2)	1	22	37	26	42	127
	2	35	1	0	1	37
Total		57	38	26	43	164

Table 9 clearly shows relationship between work experience and marital status, married people having more experience as compared to unmarried.

Chi-Square Tests - Table 10

	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	75.515 ^a	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	80.350	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	49.587	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	164		

a. 0 cells (.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 5.87.

The value of Pearson Chi-square test shows clearly a significant relationship between marital status and work experience. Thus the results of different crosstabs are also leading to the acceptance of first hypothesis.

Descriptive Statistics- Table 11

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
OC-1(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	2.08	.836	164
OC-2(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	2.73	1.168	164
OC-3(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	2.51	1.148	164
OC-4(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	2.37	1.009	164
OC-5(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	2.63	1.085	164
OC-6(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	1.87	1.069	164
OC-7(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	2.20	.828	164
OC-8(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	4.00	1.167	164
OC-9(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	3.27	1.245	164
OC-10(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	4.35	.977	164
OC-11(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	3.89	.829	164
JS-1(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	4.45	.845	164
JS-2(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	2.09	.919	164
JS-3(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	3.85	.711	164
JS-4(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	3.21	1.026	164
JS-5(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	3.92	.726	164
JS-6(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	4.23	1.041	164
JS-7(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	2.88	1.002	164
JS-8(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	2.96	1.017	164
JS-9(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	3.92	.872	164
JS-10(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	4.31	.811	164
JS-11(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	4.04	.817	164
JS-12(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	4.17	.904	164

Correlations

		JS-1(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-2(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-3(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-4(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-5(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-6(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-7(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-8(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-9(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-10(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-11(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	JS-12(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)
OC-1(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	-.111	.110	-.187 ^{**}	.009	-.212 ^{**}	-.091	.004	-.039	.093	-.163 [*]	-.131	-.253 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.157	.160	.017	.911	.006	.246	.957	.618	.237	.037	.095	.001
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
OC-2(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	.084	.034	.034	.279 ^{**}	-.083	-.308 ^{**}	.391 ^{**}	.388 ^{**}	-.027	-.060	-.046	-.206 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.282	.661	.668	.000	.290	.000	.000	.000	.731	.442	.560	.008
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
OC-3(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	.016	.159 [*]	-.058	-.291 ^{**}	-.113	.144	-.191 [*]	-.202 ^{**}	.035	.058	-.213 ^{**}	.057
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.834	.042	.462	.000	.150	.066	.014	.010	.659	.457	.006	.468
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
OC-4(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	-.235 ^{**}	.023	-.241 ^{**}	-.117	-.144	-.529 ^{**}	.135	.093	-.274 ^{**}	-.132	-.324 ^{**}	-.210 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.768	.002	.135	.065	.000	.084	.236	.000	.091	.000	.007
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
OC-5(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	-.203 ^{**}	.132	-.197 ^{**}	-.541 ^{**}	-.239 ^{**}	.247 ^{**}	-.538 ^{**}	-.653 ^{**}	-.005	.046	-.093	.195 [*]
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.092	.012	.000	.002	.001	.000	.000	.950	.555	.236	.012
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
OC-6(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	-.296 ^{**}	.074	-.331 ^{**}	.243 ^{**}	-.234 ^{**}	-.542 ^{**}	.335 ^{**}	.401 ^{**}	-.327 ^{**}	-.350 ^{**}	-.359 ^{**}	-.409 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.343	.000	.002	.003	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
OC-7(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	-.335 ^{**}	.138	-.337 ^{**}	-.049	-.341 ^{**}	-.308 ^{**}	-.089	-.005	-.114	-.274 ^{**}	-.294 ^{**}	-.332 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.079	.000	.531	.000	.000	.255	.953	.145	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
OC-8(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	.056	-.006	.244 ^{**}	-.251 ^{**}	-.072	.283 ^{**}	-.535 ^{**}	-.501 ^{**}	.295 ^{**}	.357 ^{**}	.219 ^{**}	.355 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.477	.942	.002	.001	.357	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.005	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
OC-9(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	.204 ^{**}	-.103	.115	.348 ^{**}	.078	-.384 ^{**}	.539 ^{**}	.600 ^{**}	-.189 [*]	-.213 ^{**}	-.066	-.347 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.191	.143	.000	.318	.000	.000	.000	.015	.006	.402	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
OC-10(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	.284 ^{**}	-.193 [*]	.561 ^{**}	-.143	.247 ^{**}	.265 ^{**}	-.206 ^{**}	-.300 ^{**}	.364 ^{**}	.527 ^{**}	.389 ^{**}	.473 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.013	.000	.067	.001	.001	.008	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
OC-11(SD-1,D-2,N-3,A-4,SA-5)	Pearson Correlation	.324 ^{**}	-.277 ^{**}	.566 ^{**}	.085	.454 ^{**}	.192 [*]	.168 [*]	.118	.242 ^{**}	.416 ^{**}	.460 ^{**}	.353 ^{**}
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.277	.000	.014	.031	.132	.002	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.046	.000	.239	.000	.014	.016	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164	164

From the correlation matrix it is clear that all the values are between 0-1, so there is a correlation between the items either positive or negative. Those variables which are having more than .5 values are having higher correlation as compared to those which are having lower values than .5. Also the value of significance shows that the relationship between inclusive organization culture and job satisfaction, thus accepting the second hypothesis. The 10th variable of inclusive organization culture i.e. my organization is people centered and believes in participation of all employees and 3rd variable of job satisfaction i.e. my organization encourages people to think in unique and independent ways to maximize effectiveness are showing a high positive correlation value of .561. Similarly the 11th variable of inclusive organization culture i.e. my organization places high priority on constructive interpersonal relationships and 3rd variable of job satisfaction are also showing a high positive correlation value of .566. Also the 10th variable of inclusive organization culture and 10th variable of job satisfaction i.e. I am satisfied with the fair treatment given to all employees is showing high positive correlation value of .527.

Implications of The Study

1. This study clearly reveals that there is significant difference in males and females in recruitment, promotion etc. as revealed from the results of ANOVA as well as crosstabs.
2. The results of correlation clearly imply that there is significant relationship between inclusive organization culture practices and job satisfaction, however some of the variables of inclusive organization culture are positively impacting job satisfaction and some are negatively impacting but impact is there, and higher value is more for positive impact.

Policy Options

1. All the organizations whether public or private have adopted the gender equity practices, but they need to be strengthened more as there is still a gap in terms of recruitment, promotions etc. in service sector, not to talk of manufacturing and other sectors.
2. Inclusive organization culture definitely impacts job satisfaction and can further lead to organization effectiveness and lower turnover of employees, especially if management becomes more gender sensitive in terms of flexi time, equity in compensation, promotions etc.

Conclusion

Inclusive organization culture is the need of the hour as it is the only way to manage workforce diversity and increase creativity and innovativeness. All these measures increase a sense of equity among employees which enhances job satisfaction leading to greater job involvement and organization commitment. The employees of such organizations feel like citizens of these organizations and collectively lead to the success of the organization.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations. *Gender & Society*, 4(2), 139-158.
- Ahuja, M.K., Chudoba, K.A., Kaemer, C.J. (2007). IT road warriors: Balancing work-family conflict, job autonomy and work overload to mitigate turnover intentions. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(1), 1-17.
- Alvesson, M., & Billing, Y.D. (1992). Gender and Organization: Towards a Differentiated Understanding. *Organization Studies*, 13(1), 73-103.
- Anbarasu, J., & Annette, B. (2010). A Study on Attitudinal Hindrances and Human Resource Practices in Empowering Women Construction Workers. *The IUP Journal of Organisational Behaviour*, IX(3).
- Bailyn, L. (2003). Academic Careers and Gender Equity: Lessons Learned from MIT. *Gender, Work & Any other Organization*, 10(2), 137-153.
- Belanger, F. (1999). Workers' Propensity to Telecommute: An Empirical Study. *Information and Management*, 35(3), 139-153.
- Biswas, S. (2010). Relationship between psychological climate and turnover intentions and its impact on organizational effectiveness: A study in Indian Organisations, *IIMB Management Review*, 22, 102-110.
- Budhapriya, S. (1999). *Women in Management*. APH publishing corporation, New Delhi.
- Budhapriya, S. (2009). Work – Family Challenges and Their Impact on Career Decisions: A Study of Indian Women Professionals. *Vikalpa*, 34(1), 31-45.
- Chalfosky, N. (2003). Meaningful Work. *T+D*, 57(12), 54-58.
- Chawla, D., & Sondhi, N. (2011). Assessing the role of organisational and personal factors in predicting turnover intentions: A case of school teachers and BPO employees. *Decision*, 38(2), 5-33.
- Cherian, J., & Prasad, K. V. (1995). *Women, work and Inequality: The Reality of Gender*. National Labour Institute, New Delhi.
- Chugh, S., & Sehgal, P. (2007). Why do few women advance to leadership positions? *Global Business Review*, 8:2, 351-365.
- Cooke, R.A. & Lafferty, J.C. (1989). *The Organisational Culture Inventory*. Plymouth, MI: Human Synergistics.
- Greenberg, J. & Baron, A. R. (2003). *Behavior in Organisations (8th Ed.)*. New Delhi, India: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Hearn, J. & Parkin, W. (1987). *Sex at Work: The Power and Paradox of Organisational Sexuality*. New York: St. Martins Press, 20-24.
- Hewlett, A. S., & Rashid, R. (2010). The Battle for Female Talent in Emerging Markets. *Harvard Business Review*, May Issue, 101-106.
- Ibarra, H., Carter, M.N., & Silva, C. (2010). Why Men still get more promotions than women. *Harvard business review Journal on organization Behaviour*.
- Igbaria M., & Greenhaus, J.H. (1992). Determinants of MIS employees' turnover intentions: A structural equation model. *Communications of the ACM*, 35(2), 35-49.
- Robbins, S.P. (2001). *Organisational theory: Structure, design and applications (3rd Ed.)*. New Delhi, India: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
- Sandhu, H.S and Mehta, R. (2007). Personal and Organisational Correlates Affecting Attitudes of Women Executives Towards their Job. *Global Business Review*, 8:1, 135-151.
- Schnake, M. E. (1983). An empirical assessment of the effects of affective response in the measurement of organisational climate. *Personnel Psychology*, 36(4), 791-807.